

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 are sought to be amended. Claims 11, 15, and 19 are sought to be cancelled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page two of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,340 to Abecassis (hereinafter Abecassis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,616,876 to Cluts (hereinafter Cluts). In view of the above amendments, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

- (b) selecting one or more specific clips from said plurality of selectable multimedia clips for playing by said at least one multimedia device, with said selecting of specific clips accomplished by user interaction with a menu generated by the server using wireless markup language (WML) standard;
- (c) generating a playlist using WML standard in the media server wherein the selected one or more of said plurality of selectable multimedia clips is included therein;

Abecassis and Cluts do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, "a menu generated by the server using wireless markup language (WML)", as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Abecassis and Cluts, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "generating a playlist using WML", as recited in claim 1. Nowhere in Abecassis or Cluts is it disclosed that a playlist or menu is generated using WML.

On page six of the Office Action, the Examiner implicitly asserted that Col. 25, line 59 to Col. 26, line 7 of Abecassis discloses a list being generated and displayed using a WML standard. However, upon close examination, Abecassis only discloses a system that publishes various information on a web page. Applicant notes that WML was not specifically mentioned. Further, Applicant assert that information published on a web page is commonly understood to be in HTML format, not WML.

For at least the reasons stated above, Abecassis and Cluts, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "generating a playlist using WML", as recited in claim 1. Further, claims 7, 8, 14 and 16 are patentable over Abecassis and Cluts, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, and 18 which depend from one of claims 1 and 8 are thus patentable over Abecassis and Cluts, alone or in combination, for the reasons presented above.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, both claims recite, in part, "display WML . . . content" As discussed above, neither Abecassis nor Cluts teaches or suggests generating and displaying a playlist using WML standard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16-18.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page nine of the Office Action, claims 11, 15, and 19-20 were rejected under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Abecassis in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,256,623 to Jones (hereinafter Jones). Claims 11, 15, and 19 have been cancelled to expedite prosecution, therefore rendering the rejection with respect to these claims moot. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in a continuation application. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection with respect to remaining claim 20.

Claim 20 depends from claim 1 and is thus patentable over Abecassis and Jones, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 20.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward J. Kessler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,688

Date: 19 Sept. 2005
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

440447_2